

Vedanta Madhuryam

Salutations to all.

Though it is a wrong notion that each and every person in the world is seeking a different goal, still this is what we all are taught and what is remembered at all times. And this wrong notion leads a person to forget the real purpose or goal of life. The real goal of life for each and every being, irrespective of all differentiations, is complete cessation of sorrow and ever rejoicing in bliss. Until this goal of life is achieved a person will roam here and there. All worldly experiences irrespective of whether it is sensory or supersensory will only lead to sorrow because the entire world is temporary or constantly changing. Not knowing the temporary-sorrowful nature of the world, majority of people seek worldly pleasures and experience only sorrow. As age passes by the equipment to enjoy sensual pleasure, the body, becomes weak and therefore is renounced (this is called death). Even after the body is tired and is renounced, still desires for sensual pleasures are there in the mind. Hence the person takes up another body in order to enjoy sensual pleasures. This is called as a birth. The cycle of birth and death continues over and over again leading only to the result of sorrows. As Sankara beautifully puts it in Bhaja Govindam, again birth, again death and again in the womb of the mother - this goes on and on like an ocean. Hence the transmigration from birth to death is called ocean of transmigration (or samsaara saagara). It is very tough to cross over this samsaara saagara by the various means that are available in the world as the world itself is the samsaara saagara.

But very few wise people realize this temporary-sorrowful nature of the world and therefore they seek removal of sorrow and rejoicing in bliss. They realize that bliss is possible only by realization of the entity of Brahman which is eternal and the substratum of the entire world (the world which appears as existing but is just an illusion of names and forms in Brahman).

Brahman is known only from the shastras and therefore such wise people strive to learn the shastras from a Guru. Though there are different philosophies or darshanas created out of the shastras, the ultimate is Vedanta. Vedanta is the philosophy of knowledge as found in the Upanishads or end portion of Vedas. Vedanta talks about one Brahman alone existing at all times. This one Brahman is the very source-substratum of the world. This Brahman isn't something different from oneself but it is one's own very nature of Consciousness - that which pulsates inside as I-exist, I-exist at all times.

Though a person learns from the shastras that I am Brahman of the nature of Consciousness, still conviction doesn't grow therefore the person has to go through the three steps of sravana, manana and nidhidhyaasana. Sravana is listening again and again to the scriptures with import on the ultimate reality of Brahman. Manana is reflecting on whatever has been heard on the basis of logic; thus logically it is asserted that Brahman alone exists at all times. Finally nidhidhyaasana or contemplation of the ultimate truth that Brahman alone exists at all times has to be implemented. Contemplation automatically leads to eternal bliss eventually. These three steps of that of knowledge and doesn't involve any action or the world. Vedanta emphasizes again and again that knowledge of Brahman as found in Vedanta is the one and only way to eternal bliss or the state of moksha.

But contrary to worldly sciences, Vedanta isn't attractive to all. This is of course a wrong notion as a result of lack of understanding the nuances of Vedanta. The attempt here is to show the beauty of Vedanta so that we will be able to learn Vedanta and implement it in our lives thereby leading to the ultimate goal of life as rejoicing in bliss at all times.

May we all strive to learn Vedanta with passion so that through understanding and implementation we will be able to realize our very nature of Brahman and will be able to ever rejoice in bliss here and now itself.

AUM NAMA SHIVAYA

Nov 16th

Aukramaanika

Vedanta Madhuryam	1
Brahmaananda Siddhi	4
Chathussutra Prakaashah	14
Avidyaa Prakaashah	20
Sukha Nirupanam.....	30
Aukramaanika Nirdesham	33

Brahmaananda Siddhi

Ultimate goal of life

It is important to understand as to what is the goal of life. Without goal of life, a person will be just roaming around enjoying just some sensual pleasures that are thrown to him. We know that even in worldly life it is essential to set goals so that there is constant effort in order to achieve those goals. A student who doesn't have any goal of what to become will not really progress anywhere except just clearing some examinations in school. Similarly a professional will not go anywhere than just earning money and killing time if there is no goal in life.

When even in worldly life goals are important, what to talk about goals in spiritual life? Spiritual life is as important or more important than worldly life. This is because worldly life continues one birth after the other; there isn't anything new happening in any life as whatever has been achieved in this life is continued in the next birth. Though continuation of actions and results does happen in multiple births, that doesn't serve any purpose at all. Even after spending an entire birth, a person isn't able to gain anything. Effectively, there is nothing achieved except one birth being wasted in futile sensual pleasures.

In spirituality a person is called a sadhaka. Sadhaka is one who strives towards the sadhya or a goal to be achieved. This goal is very special in itself that if this is achieved then nothing else remains to be achieved. This goal is thus the ultimate goal of life. It is the ultimate goal as there isn't any goal bigger than this; it is also the ultimate goal of life as it puts an end to life itself (life of birth and death ends when this ultimate goal of achieved). Once this ultimate goal of life is achieved a person then will not have any more goals - the person will be ever blissful, ever content and ever satisfied.

This ultimate goal characterized by complete cessation of sorrow and rejoicing in bliss is what is been sought by each and every person either knowingly or unknowingly. Majority of people seek this ultimate goal unknowingly whereas few are those who knowingly seek it - the former are called worldly people and the latter are called spiritual people.

The very fact that we all try to go higher and higher or our desires increase more and more shows that we want something that is the peak (there is nothing higher than that). The first step in spirituality is to realize the ultimate goal of life. This ultimate goal of life or eternal

bliss is termed in Vedanta as moksha. The word moksha means liberation; liberation from bondage, sorrows and sufferings. This is thus the state where a person is able to ever rejoice in bliss at all times. Irrespective of whether the world exists or not, whatever the state of the world be, the person will be able ever rejoice in bliss.

This ultimate goal of life as moksha is to be first known as the target or goal of life itself. Until this happens, we will be struggling to gain eternal bliss with no result at all (other than sorrow alone).

Though there are people who know that the ultimate goal of life is moksha in the form of eternal bliss, still rarely are those who are able to achieve this goal or are able to progress towards this goal. As to why this is the case, the answer lies in an improper understanding of the world.

World - temporary and sorrowful

The world is experienced continuously by everybody. And there is happiness achieved from the world (which is also a matter of experience for everybody). As long as this happiness is achieved, we seek happiness more and more from the world. Though one job fails to give us happiness we still seek another job in the hope that we will get eternal bliss from that job. This means that we all seek eternal bliss in the world. Since the world consists of infinite possibilities therefore there is dearth for seeking from the world. This seeking of eternal bliss from the world thereby continues for many births.

The only way a person will be able to really seek eternal bliss is through knowledge of the world - without true knowledge of the world or knowledge of the true nature of the world, a person will still seek eternal bliss from the world (to no use or purpose). The more a person seeks the world, the more the world will delude and lead to sorrow.

The world is defined by the Lord in Gita as anityam and asukham (temporary and sorrowful). The world is constantly changing. Anything and everything part of the world is changing every minute though these changes may not be perceptible by the naked eye. Thus though we may not see a table as changing or our body as changing, they are changing (science easily proves through microscope and other means that everything in the world is constantly changing). That which constantly changes is called temporary. Such temporary entity finally leads to its own death. It also has a birth. We know through the

scriptures that the world was created and will be destroyed. That which has a birth, death and therefore is constantly changing is sorrowful in nature. It is sorrowful as it ceases to exist at some point of time, when we expect it to be existing (in order to experience happiness). Though we sometimes experience happiness from the world, this happiness is so short-lived that it is sorrow alone. Thus wise people after analyzing the world say that the world is seed of sorrow and therefore such people will not take resort to the world (for eternal bliss).

Three types of sorrow from the world

Though we might argue that there is some happiness, at least, from the world and that this is better than seeking a totally-unknown eternal bliss, it is very clear that the world always leads to sorrow alone. The happiness the world appears to give is just sorrowful alone.

In order to get happiness from the world, we have to put a lot of effort into obtaining and possessing objects (or people). These efforts are hard and therefore sorrowful naturally. Once the objects are possessed, though there is happiness it is sorrowful alone as a person fears as to when the objects will be lost. And lastly when the objects are lost then there is sorrow through memory of the time when the object was possessed. Thus we find that before achieving objects, while possessing objects and when objects are lost, there is only sorrow.

These three types of sorrow as called - taapa dukha, parinaama dukha and samskaara dukha (taapa means suffering due to effort, parinaama means due to change and samskaara means out of memory of previously possessing objects).

Sadhaka - seeking eternal bliss

A wise person is one who realizing the sorrowful nature of the world will stop seeking the world. Only such a person will be able to look for the real source of eternal bliss (rather than still seeking it from the external world). Such a wise person is a true sadhaka who seeks the only sadhya of eternal bliss (the ultimate goal of life).

It should be remembered that such a sadhaka knows the temporary and sorrowful nature of the world and therefore will never fall a prey to the pleasures of the world. Irrespective of whatever is thrown at the sadhaka, he will ward it off with ease (without even thinking twice). Today we are in a world where even so-called sadhakas will fall for worldly pleasures

if they are offered by people. Nachiketha is one person in the shastras was a true sadhaka. He was offered a lot of pleasures by Yama but still he was able to set them aside because he knew that they all would not lead to eternal bliss - therefore he still persisted (stuck to the goal) and thereby through instruction from Yama was able to attain the state of moksha.

Sadhakas are people who constantly seek eternal bliss and eternal bliss alone. They aren't deluded by anything else in the world. Now such sadhakas, through their persistence to the goal of eternal bliss will come to know that which is the abode of eternal bliss - or that by knowing which eternal bliss achieved; or that which is denoted by the state of moksha.

Brahman - source of eternal bliss

The changing world requires a changeless substratum even as a changing variable requires a changeless constant for its substratum. This world which is constantly changing requires a changeless substratum. This substratum has to be changeless in nature. This substratum thus also has to be eternal in nature (for if it has birth or death then it will be changing in nature). If we accept the substratum of the world to be changing even as the substratum of our living is the earth which itself is changing, then we will have to find out another substratum of the changing substratum. This analysis will be stretched over and over until we find a changeless substratum. Thus due to simplicity (or laaghava) we can say that the substratum of the changing world itself is changeless.

By being changeless in nature, it is blissful in nature also. From another perspective, this changeless entity is without any limitations (as limitations cause changes, death and sorrow). By being infinite or unlimited, this changeless substratum is blissful in nature. This entity is termed in the scriptures as Brahman (that which is very big - so big that there isn't anything bigger than this - this means it is infinite or unlimited). This entity by existing at all times is also Sat or Existence in nature. And Sat requires a light to illumine, therefore Sat is Chit or Consciousness in nature (that light which illumines all existence). Sat, Chit and Ananda are thus the very nature of Brahman. They aren't qualities as they are ever present in Brahman (and they aren't something which changes in Brahman).

Brahman as the source-substratum of the world is blissful in nature and therefore Brahman is the goal of moksha. Once a person attains Brahman, then moksha is attained and eternal

bliss is attained. But Brahman by being the substratum of the world cannot be attained as long a person focuses on the world.

World - an illusion in Brahman

The changing-sorrowful world can never really exist in the changeless-blissful Brahman (as contrary in nature). Therefore Vedanta says that the world is just an illusion or appearance in Brahman. Even as various gold ornaments are mere names and forms in gold, similarly the entire world is mere names and forms in Brahman. Even as snake is seen in rope, water is seen in desert and the dream world is seen in the dreamer, similarly this world appears in Brahman. It doesn't have any existence at all but appears as if existing (even as dream appears as if real or existing while dreaming and once we wake up we realize that there never was any dream). Once a person wakes up from the dream of this waking world, then the person realizes that the waking world doesn't exist at all and Brahman alone exists (at all times).

We have to remember that even though we may see dream, dream doesn't exist. Similarly even though the world might appear as existing (before realization or after realization) it doesn't really exist and therefore its appearance (as-if-existing) doesn't harm the truth that Brahman alone exists.

Scriptures or knowledge - source of Brahman

After knowing that the world is sorrowful and Brahman as the source-substratum of the world is blissful, a person strives to know about Brahman (and attain Brahman). This attaining of Brahman is possible only through the scriptures. The scriptures are words of experience of masters who have attained Brahman. Thus they are the only proofs of Brahman. Any other means in the world cannot lead to Brahman as it only focuses on the world and will not take us to the substratum of the world.

Even as water in desert or dream world vanishes only after knowledge, similarly Brahman as the substratum of the world is known only through knowledge. Thus knowledge is the only means to moksha. Here knowledge isn't worldly sciences but knowledge of the scriptures. The subject-matter of scriptures is Brahman and therefore through learning the scriptures a person learns about Brahman and as to how to attain Brahman.

If Brahman is attained then it will be temporary because anything that is attained will be lost as well. Thus Vedanta says that Brahman isn't newly attained but Brahman is realized by a sadhaka.

Brahman - not attained, but realized

Even as nothing new is created when a person knows water in desert to be desert, similarly knowing Brahman is realization and nothing new is really created. Ignorance of Brahman (or the ultimate reality behind the world) makes a person experience sorrow and this ignorance is removed through knowledge of Brahman.

Knowledge of Brahman though is realization would still be temporary unless Brahman is our very nature of pure Consciousness. Thus Vedanta says that the Consciousness pulsating inside us as I-exist, I-exist is Brahman. That this I is Brahman is easily proven as I exist at all times (Sat in nature), I am ever shining (Consciousness in nature) and I am never disliked (thus I am blissful in nature). By being of the nature of Sat Chit Ananda, I am of the nature of Brahman.

If I am Brahman then why don't I experience bliss of Brahman?

Because there is superimposition of the world on this I of Brahman (or Self). Therefore when we say I we mean the body, the indriyas, the mind, the intellect and the world - association of the individual with the external world (which includes the body, mind, intellect as well) is the cause of not experiencing bliss of Brahman. Since the world is limited and sorrowful therefore when I consider myself as associated with the world, I experience only sorrow.

Through knowledge of the scriptures and negation of the world (or everything that is the not-Self) from the Self (Brahman), a person gets rid of superimposition. Thereby a person experiences bliss of Brahman. This experience isn't a worldly experience but it is experience of oneself as bliss in nature. A person while progressing towards moksha itself will be able to experience bliss pervading one's existence (through real implementation of knowledge that I am Brahman, that Brahman which is the substratum of the world and that Brahman which alone exists at all times).

Before getting direct experience of bliss of Brahman, the state of deep sleep or sushupti clearly shows us that bliss is available in Brahman (that in which the world doesn't really exist).

Sushupti - the state of bliss

We all experience three states. First is the waking state, second is the dream state and the third is the dreamless deep sleep state. In the first two states there is duality and as a result there is only sorrow. In the third state, duality temporarily vanishes. And therefore we find that we experience eternal bliss in that state. Wherever duality completely merges, there an individual merges unto Brahman or Self. And since this state of deep sleep clearly shows that bliss is experienced therefore we can say beyond doubt that Brahman is blissful in nature.

Though many contemplate on Brahman why aren't they able to experience bliss?

This is because we have to contemplate on Brahman alone existing. As long as duality is considered as real there will be sorrow alone irrespective of whether we seek Brahman or not. Brahman is non-dual or there is nothing apart from Brahman here. Until this Brahman (which is non-dual in nature) is sought out there will be only sorrow. Only when a sadhaka thus contemplates on Brahman alone existing as one's very nature of pure Consciousness, there will be direct experience of bliss.

Once a person realizes Brahman as one's nature of Self and ever contemplates on this truth, the person will be rejoicing in bliss. When the person naturally abides in Brahman, then the person is said to be realized and the world or its activities will not affect the person, even little bit. This realization is ever present even now but due to ignorance of Brahman, this realized state isn't known and therefore sorrow is experienced. Since sorrow (and the world) isn't real therefore it is removed through knowledge that it doesn't exist and blissful Brahman alone exists at all times.

Though there are so many paths prescribed for moksha, the scriptures say beyond doubt that knowledge alone is the way to eternal bliss because ignorance is what obstructs the ever-present blissful Brahman. Though we may term this knowledge as bhakthi or yoga, it is realization (or contemplation) of the truth that Brahman alone exists. If contemplation isn't part of knowledge or bhakthi or yoga or karma, then it will not lead to eternal bliss. Karma by itself only leads to purity of mind and it is knowledge, and only knowledge, which

will make us realize that blissful Brahman as our very nature of Consciousness alone exists at all times.

In order to ever abide in Brahman, the scriptures say that jnaana or knowledge consists of sravana, manana and nidhidhyaasana. Sravana is listening to the scriptures with import on Brahman. Manana is reflecting in the mind (thereby removing all doubts) through logic that Brahman alone exists. Nidhidhyaasana is constant contemplation of the truth that Brahman alone exists here. Through implementation of sravana, manana and nidhidhyaasana a person will be able to quickly realize Brahman and ever rejoice in bliss.

Conclusion

The ultimate goal of life is eternal bliss (untainted by sorrow). As we have seen the world is temporary and sorrowful. Therefore a wise person will not seek sensual pleasures of the world. Through proper analysis the wise person will seek the source-substratum of Brahman through knowledge of the scriptures. Through implementation of this knowledge (through sravana, manana and nidhidhyaasana) such a person will be able to quickly ever abide in contemplation of Brahman alone existing as one's own very nature of blissful Consciousness. Thereby such a person will ever rejoice in bliss (realizing his state of ever-liberated existing, such a person never experiences sorrow but ever rejoices in bliss alone).

May we all strive to achieve the ultimate goal of life as moksha through constant contemplation of Brahman as the substratum of the world and pure Consciousness which pulsates inside us as I-exist, I-exist so that we will be able to get rid of sorrow and will be able to ever rejoice in bliss here and now itself.

Anumaanas to prove Brahman alone is blissful

जगत् असुखं दुःखपूर्णमैव, अनित्यत्वात्, कन्दुकवत् ।१।

jagat asukhaṁ duḥkhapūrṇameva, anityatvāt, kandukavat|1|

1. World is without happiness and filled with sorrow, because of being temporary in nature, like a ball.

जगत् त्याज्यं, दुःखस्वरूपत्वात् परिणाम ताप संस्कार दुःखयुक्तत्वात्, विषवत् ।२।

jagat tyājyaṁ, duḥkhasvarūpatvāt pariṇāma tāpa saṁskāra duḥkhayuktatvāt, viṣavat|2|

2. World is to be renounced, because of being of the nature of sorrow and associated with sorrow due to changes, effort/suffering and memories, like poison.

स्वात्मा आनन्दस्वरूपः, अनुभवात् दुःखास्पृहत्वाच्च सुषुप्तौ, कृपणस्य वित्तवत् ।३ ।

svātmā ānandasvarūpaḥ, anubhavāt duḥkhāspṛhatvācca suṣuptau, kṛpaṇasya vittavat|3|

3. One's own Self is blissful in nature, due to being experienced and devoid of sorrow as found in sushupti, like wealth of a miser.

स्वात्मा आनन्दस्वरूपः, विकारवर्जितत्वात् अवस्थात्रयसाक्षीरूपत्वाच्च, मुक्तवत् ।४ ।

svātmā ānandasvarūpaḥ, vikāravarjitatvāt avasthātrayasākṣīrūpatvācca, muktavat|4|

4. One's own Self is blissful in nature, due to being devoid of changes and of the form of witness to the three avasthaas of jagrat (waking), svapna (dream) and sushupti (dreamless deep-sleep), like a liberated person.

ब्रह्म सुखस्वरूपः, उपाधि अतीतत्वात् आकाशवत् ।५ ।

brahma sukhasvarūpaḥ, upādhi atītatvāt, ākāśavat|5|

5. Brahman is of the nature of happiness/bliss, because of being beyond adjuncts, like space.

ब्रह्म सुखस्वरूपः, सच्चित्स्वरूपत्वात् स्वात्मवत् ।६ ।

brahma sukhasvarūpaḥ, saccitsvarūpatvāt, svātmavat|6|

6. Brahman is of the nature of bliss, by being of the nature of Sat-Chit (existence-consciousness), like one's own Self.

ब्रह्मैव आनन्दस्वरूपः, अद्वितीयत्वात् निरपेक्षत्वाच्च, स्वात्मवत् ।७ ।

brahmaiva ānandasvarūpaḥ, advitīyatvāt nirapekṣatvācca, svātmavat|7|

7. Brahman alone is blissful in nature, because of being non-dual and absolute, like one's own Self.

Summarizing Sloka

अनित्यमसुखं लोकं त्याज्यंसदातुज्ञानेन ।

ब्रह्मणानन्दप्राप्तिश्च अद्वैतीयत्वरूपेण ॥

anityamasukham lokam tyājyaṁsadātujñānenal
brahmaṇānandaprāptiśca advaitīyatvarūpeṇa ॥

The world which is temporary and sorrowful has to be renounced through knowledge; through Brahman alone a person can attain bliss because of Brahman being non-dual in nature (nothing apart from Brahman existing).

Chathussutra Prakaashah

Shareeraka Nyaya Sangraha

First Sutra

अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा

athāto brahmajijñāsā

Now, therefore let us desire to know Brahman.

Summary of first sutra

We ended the analysis of first sutra as per the work of Prakashatma in the last magazine. It was concluded that Brahman alone has to be enquired.

Why?

Because

- Brahman alone is real
- Brahman alone is blissful
- Brahman is our very nature of "I"
- The world is an illusion
- The "I" associated with the world is just an illusion (or wrong knowledge)
- Sorrow is experienced and we want to get rid of sorrow and ever rejoice in bliss

Though Brahman is well known as the non-dual reality behind the temporary appearing world (and as the Consciousness which pulsates inside us as I-exist, I-exist) still Brahman has to be defined, as per the shastras. Thus we find Vyaasa explaining as to what is Brahman in the second sutra of Brahma Sutras.

Second Sutra

जन्माद्यस्य यतः

janmādyasya yataḥ

(Brahman is) that from which creation etc. (creation, protection and destruction) of the world happens.

Literal Translation of the work

Due to the world's creation, protection and destruction not being able to be the svarooapa lakshana (characteristics as nature), if it is upalakshana (indirect or relative characteristics) then svarooapa wouldn't be known, in the substratum of existence-consciousness-bliss natured characteristics-entity non-dual-infinite-worded-Brahman's svarooapa goes against the upalakshana, the world (and its creation-protection-destruction) being illusory (maayaatmaka) therefore such definition cannot be the upalakshana of Brahman and (Brahman) by being (or if) qualified by Maya there would be considering the world as Brahman itself from the perspective of cause (Brahman being cause); we will have to conclude that pure Brahman which is to be enquired (and known) by mumukshus cannot be defined in characteristics.

(The above part and this month's entire analysis is the purvapakshin's view point which will be answered by the siddhantin later, in next few magazines).

Types of characteristics (definition)

Since Brahman is to be enquired therefore Brahman is to be first defined. Definitions or characteristics are of three types - first is vyaavritta lakshana, second is thatastha lakshana (or upalakshana) and third is svarooapa lakshana.

Vyaavritta lakshana is differentiating characteristics - here definition is based on negation of things which the entity is not. The common example of this is neti, neti (not this, not this) way of defining Brahman. Whatever can be defined or mentioned as "this" isn't Brahman.

Thatastha lakshana is where definition is related to something part of the world. The common example is - a person goes to a new village to find a house and enquires to a passer-by. The passer-by says that the house upon which a crow is sitting is the house. This definition of the house is a relative definition (or sub-definition) because the crow isn't permanently sitting on the house. With respect to Brahman, the relative definition is two-fold - one is that Brahman is the creator-protector-destroyer of the world (cause-substratum) and second is that Brahman is the saakshi or witness of the three states (bodies).

Svaroopalakshana is where an entity is defined with respect to its nature. With respect to Brahman, the svaroopalakshana is that Brahman is Sat or existence, Chit or consciousness and Ananda or bliss in nature.

Svaroopalakshana - the definitive definition

Though the other types of lakshana of vyaavritta and thatastha can be given, the real definitive definition for an entity is svaroopalakshana alone. This is because other definitions are based on other or different entities whereas svaroopalakshana alone talks about the entity as such.

With respect to Brahman as well, svaroopalakshana is essential in order to define Brahman. If it is shown that svaroopalakshana of Brahman isn't possible then it would lead to the conclusion that Brahman doesn't exist. And when such an entity of Brahman doesn't exist, enquiry into Brahman would be futile.

Brahman's upalakshana - creator-protector-destroyer of the world

Brahman is mentioned in the Sutra as the creator-protector-destroyer of the world. Thus we can see that this is thatastha lakshana or upalakshana of Brahman. It isn't svaroopalakshana because it talks about Brahman with respect to the world (not directly explaining Brahman's nature). Such upalakshana cannot really define the entity of Brahman. So we would have to conclude that Brahman's svaroopalakshana is impossible. For if Brahman's svaroopalakshana was possible to be defined then the sutra would have given svaroopalakshana instead of thatastha lakshana.

Since only thatastha lakshana has been given here therefore we would have to conclude that svaroopalakshana of Brahman is impossible.

Now if it is argued that svaroopalakshana is there but not explained then we will have to conclude that svaroopalakshana cannot be known. Vedanta obviously says that Brahman cannot be known through mind or words. Thus we will have to conclude that Brahman's svaroopalakshana cannot be known. That whose svaroopalakshana cannot be known doesn't really exist or it is fruitless or useless because we cannot have any knowledge of it.

Now even if somehow we accept that svaroopalakshana is there and it is the subject of everything, hence it cannot be explained or defined then we will encounter more objections.

Svaroopā is against thatastha lakshana

Svaroopā of Brahman is mentioned as non-dual and infinite subject of everything. Thatastha lakshana of Brahman is given as creator-protector-destroyer of the world. We find here that both svaroopā and thatastha are contrary to each other. That Brahman which is non-dual and infinite cannot lead to creation of the world. There is no way that a non-dual entity can lead to any creation of any sort. Even if we let go of the non-dual nature of Brahman, still it would be impossible to explain creation of the world from Brahman. Creation of the world has to be either as a different entity from Brahman or as Brahman's modification; both of these would lead to Brahman being finite (and dual). Thus it is very clear that creation from Brahman is impossible.

In other words, Brahman's svaroopā lakshana and thatastha lakshana go against each other. This would mean that Brahman's lakshanas would have to be thrown out (considered illogical).

Now it can be said that the world is an illusion and therefore Brahman is the cause of this illusory world. This way there is no contrary-ness between svaroopā and thatastha lakshana (as Brahman being the illusory world's cause doesn't harm Brahman's non-dual and infinite nature). But this is also not logical. Why?

Upalakshana - impossible with illusory world

The world being illusory in nature, there cannot be any upalakshana with respect to it. This is because the upalakshana also will be illusory and therefore it ceases to be a lakshana itself.

The definition that "I am the owner of a car" is invalid if the car is illusory. Since my ownership of the car is illusory therefore the definition of me as the owner of the illusory car is also invalid. Such a definition though may be accepted temporarily, it doesn't serve any purpose and therefore should be renounced (or not sought out).

Brahman being the cause of the illusory world is therefore invalid and shouldn't be considered.

Now can't we answer that Brahman qualified by Maya is the cause of the world?

World becomes Brahman

If it is argued that Brahman qualified by Maya is the cause of the world and therefore thatastha lakshana is valid, then it would also lead to an illogical conclusion. Brahman being the cause of the world pervades the effect of the world. Such a world thereby is essentially one with its cause of Brahman. This would mean that the world is Brahman.

Yes, Vedanta accepts the world as Brahman - so what?

So it would lead to the conclusion that there is no enquiry of Brahman required as we already are experiencing the world and know it. Even if we don't know the world fully, we can learn about the world (through worldly sciences) and Vedanta or enquiry into Brahman is not required.

If it is said now that Brahman isn't the cause of the world then again the question of what is the svaroopalakshana of Brahman will be raised which cannot be answered; and it would again lead to the conclusion that enquiry of Brahman cannot be started.

Thus in all ways we will be led to the conclusion that enquiry into Brahman is not possible because Brahman cannot be defined.

Conclusion

Though Vyaasa defines Brahman as the creator-protector-destroyer of the world, the purvapakshin gives the below reasons to prove that Brahman cannot be defined.

1. Since only upalakshana is given, svaroopalakshana of Brahman is not known and impossible.
2. Svaroopalakshana of Brahman which is non-dual and infinite goes against upalakshana of being creator-protector-destroyer of the world.
3. Illusory world cannot have upalakshana.
4. If Brahman qualified by Maya is the creator-protector-destroyer of the world then the world becomes Brahman (and therefore definition is not required or not valid).

Due to the above reasons Brahman cannot be defined and therefore Brahman cannot be enquired into as well.

May we all strive to understand the purvapakshin's viewpoints so that through removal of these doubts we will be able to enquire into Brahman with the knowledge that Brahman is

the very cause-substratum of the world and through contemplation of Brahman as pervading the entire world we will be able to ever rejoice in bliss here and now itself.

निगमनं

ब्रह्मणो लक्षणासंभवः -

brahmaṇo lakṣaṇāsambhavaḥ -

- उपलक्षणस्य उक्तत्वात्, ततः स्वरूपस्य अज्ञातत्वात्, असंभवाच्च ।

- upalakṣaṇasya uktatvāt , tataḥ svarūpasya ajñātattvāt , asambhavācca |

- उपलक्षणस्य स्वरूपविरोधात् ।

- upalakṣaṇasya svarūpavirodhāt |

- मिथ्यायाः उपलक्षणायोगात् ।

- mithyāyāḥ upalakṣaṇāyogāt |

- जगतः मायोपाधिब्रह्मणोऽभिन्नत्वप्रसङ्गात् ।

- jagataḥ māyopādhibrahmaṇo'bhinnattvaprasaṅgāt |

अतः ब्रह्म अविचार्यं ॥

ataḥ brahma avicāryam ||

Avidyaa Prakaashah

We have seen in the previous couple of magazines illogicality of avidya with respect to its support (asraya), its veiling of Brahman (tirodhana) and its nature (svarupa).

Asraya

The purvapakshin says that avidyaa cannot be supported by Brahman because Brahman is self-luminous in nature and will lead to duality (as avidyaa becomes another entity). Avidyaa also cannot be supported by jeeva who himself isn't real and dependent on avidyaa itself for his very existence. Thus, the purvapakshin concluded that avidyaa is illogical and so is the system of Advaita Vedanta which bases itself on avidyaa.

The siddhantin replied saying that the support for avidyaa is Brahman alone as there isn't any real entity apart from Brahman. And since avidyaa isn't real therefore duality isn't affected at all. Avidyaa since it is just a matter of experience for an ignorant person and really not real therefore it doesn't cause any harm to self-luminous nature of Brahman (and also doesn't lead to duality or another real entity like Brahman).

Tirodhana

The purvapakshin said that veiling of Self or Brahman is not possible as Brahman is self-luminous in nature. That which ever shines and is Consciousness in nature can never be veiled. Thus avidyaa can never veil Brahman and therefore avidyaa itself is purposeless (avidyaa is that which veils the Self, so says Advaitin).

The siddhantin replied saying that avidyaa is only for person who is ignorant. Really speaking avidyaa doesn't exist and it cannot ever veil Brahman. And it doesn't ever veil Brahman. But for an ignorant person, the Self appears as veiled by ignorance. This is from an empirical view point. After realization of Brahman through knowledge (which removes ignorance), a person realizes the ultimate view point that Brahman alone exists. Even as light is seemingly veiled by darkness and Sun is veiled seemingly by clouds, similarly the Self is veiled by ignorance (from an empirical view point). Until knowledge of the shastras (that Brahman alone exists) dawns a person experiences ignorance (which is proven through direct experience for an ajnaani) and since ultimately Brahman alone exists, therefore there is no illogicality whatsoever.

Svarupa

The purvapakshin said that avidyaa's nature cannot be neither bhaava (existence) nor abhaava (non-existence). It cannot be bhaava because then it can never vanish (or be nullified or negated) and it cannot be abhaava because it isn't something merely non-existent (or lack of something) by being experienced (by ignorant people). It goes without saying that an entity cannot be both bhaava and abhaava. Thus avidyaa's nature cannot be determined and therefore the system which bases itself on avidyaa is illogical.

The siddhantin answered by saying that we say that avidyaa isn't abhaava and hence term it bhaava. It is neither bhaava nor abhaava but it appears as existing for an ignorant person (ultimately for a knower it doesn't exist at all). Terming avidyaa as existing (or bhaava rupa) is just for teaching purposes alone. Ultimately avidyaa has no reality at all and it just appears as existing in my Consciousness (Consciousness is changeless whereas avidyaa is changing - this itself means that avidyaa is just an illusion in Consciousness, temporarily appearing but ultimately not existing).

Let's now see the next illogicality with respect to avidyaa.

4. anirvacaniiyatvAnupapattiH- Illogicality with respect to the indeterminability of avidyaa

नास्तिसत्यतासत्यरूपतः ।

ज्ञानहीनको नाप्यसत् हि वै ॥९॥

nāstisatyatāsatyarūpataḥ|

jñānahīnako nāpyasat hi vai||9||

9. There is no reality for avidyaa because it is of the nature of unreality; avidyaa, which destroys knowledge, is not unreal as well (because it is being experienced and an entity which doesn't exist cannot be spoken about).

वाच्यवर्जितं युक्तिहीनतं ।

तेननाशितं वेददर्शनं ॥१०॥

vācyavarjitaṁ yuktihīnataṁ|

tenanāśitaṁ vedadarśanaṁ||10||

10. (Avidyaa is) Devoid of words (or explanations) and therefore devoid of logic (illogical); thus by ignorance is destroyed the philosophy of Vedas (Advaita Vedanta).

सत्ववर्जितं अल्पकालिनं ।

दृश्यरूपकं सत्वरूपकं ॥११॥

satvavarjitam alpakālinam |
dṛśyarūpakam satvarūpakam ||11||

11. By being temporary in nature (existing only for a short period of time), avidyaa is devoid of existence (Sat). But since it is experienced therefore it is of the nature of Sat (existence).

(वाचकस्तुशिष्यस्यतारणात् ।

नास्तिशिष्यभावो हि मन्मतं ॥)

(vācakastuśiṣyasatāraṇāt |
nāstīśiṣyabhāvo hi manmatam | |)

Words are for uplifting/saving a shishya; ultimately there is no shishya at all, thus is our view (words of avidyaa as existing temporarily and ultimately not existing is only for shishya's to realize).

दृष्टिभेदरूपेणविस्मृतिः ।

अस्तिसर्वदाज्ञानिने तु सा ॥१२॥

dṛṣṭibhedarūpeṇavismṛtiḥ |
astisarvadājñānine tu sā ||12||

12. Avidyaa or forgetfulness is present only as a result of perspective difference; but it always exists for an ignorant person (from ultimate perspective avidyaa doesn't exist at all and from temporary/worldly/empirical perspective, avidyaa always exists).

Slokas

The first two slokas explain the illogicality with respect to anirvachaniyatva of avidyaa. The first two slokas (9th and 10th) thus are purvapaksha statements whereas the last two (11th and 12th) slokas answer the objections and the siddhantha or advaitic view-point.

Avidyaa – a fundamental concept in Vedanta

As we have seen again and again, avidyaa is a very fundamental concept in Vedanta. It is this entity that gives life to the spiritual path and without this entity, the path itself becomes invalid or non-existent. It is always the contention of opponents of advaita vedanta that if this concept of avidyaa is proven to be illogical and non-existent then the system of advaita vedanta itself will fall apart.

But this is a wrong notion - a notion created due to improper understanding of Advaita Vedanta itself. Advaita Vedanta focuses on the concept of avidyaa only when it is required to explain the difference between a sadhaka and Brahman, a shishya and a Guru. Ultimately advaita vedanta always says that the one entity of Brahman alone exists. This Brahman is what appears as the entire world, the entire sentient beings of the world and the controller of the world (Ishwara who is the creator-protector-destroyer of the world). These appearances aren't real even as the dream world which appears as real isn't real.

That which appears as existing is due to ignorance or avidyaa. This ignorance is not-knowing one's very nature of Brahman - that Brahman which alone exists at all times. Ignorance vanishes when knowledge of Brahman is gained as found in the shastras. Once a person learns the shastras and gains knowledge that Brahman alone exists, then through constant abidance in this truth (that Brahman alone exists) the person will be able to realize and ever rejoice in bliss.

But in order to realize Brahman, a sadhaka has to progress in the spiritual path and spiritual path only exists when there is a goal to be achieved. This goal is knowledge of Brahman in the form of removal of ignorance (of one's own nature of Brahman).

Avidyaa - neither Sat nor Asat

The Lord defines in Gita both Sat and Asat. Sat is that which never ceases to exist or exists at all times. Asat is that which never has any existence or it doesn't exist at all times. Now applying this with respect to avidyaa, we find that avidyaa isn't Sat as it ceases to exist

after knowledge (or realization). Avidyaa isn't Asat as well because it appears as existing presently. Thus avidyaa is said to be neither sat nor asat. Avidyaa therefore cannot be defined in any way. Thus avidyaa is termed as anirvachaneeya or indescribable. Any way of defining avidyaa will lead to illogicalities.

From another perspective, avidyaa is the cause of words and thoughts (indriyas and the mind) - therefore words and thoughts cannot objectify avidyaa. This means that any means possible in the world cannot objectify avidyaa. And since avidyaa isn't objectified by worldly means, worldly means will not lead to removal of avidyaa as well.

Then how is avidyaa removed?

Avidyaa is removed through knowledge of Brahman as found in the shastras. Shastras talk about the subject which experiences all objects and this is different from worldly sciences which only target objects of the world. Shastras also are the very breath of Brahma (or they come into existence from Brahman when world is created). Therefore shastras talk about Brahman and through knowledge of the shastras, a person will be able to get rid of avidyaa (through the knowledge that avidyaa doesn't exist and whatever exists at all times is Brahman and Brahman alone).

Purvapakshin - avidyaa is neither Sat nor Asat

Avidyaa cannot be Sat in nature as it doesn't really exist at all times; it ceases to exist when a person realizes (one's own very nature of Brahman). Avidya cannot be Asat (like the son of a barren woman) as avidyaa appears as existing now. That which appears as existing but doesn't exist at all times isn't sat or asat.

This means that avidyaa has to be something different from sat and asat. Such an entity cannot really exist as there are only these two types of reality status for any entity. A third reality status isn't real and would only lead to mere imagination (and assumption). This is similar to a beggar imagining that he is a King - it serves no purpose. Though we may argue that the imagination is neither sat nor asat but we all know clearly that it is just an imagination with no real value or purpose. If avidyaa is mere imagination then it would be illogical along with not having any real value or purpose. And a system which bases itself on such an avidyaa itself becomes invalid and without any real value or purpose.

Purvapakshin - anirvachaniya avidyaa illogical

Advaitin replies to the arguments of avidyaa being neither sat nor asat through terming avidyaa as anirvachaniya or indescribable. Such indescribable entity is illogical by itself. To say that something cannot be defined or described means that it doesn't really exist or that it cannot be really known. If avidyaa doesn't really exist then it would mean that the system of advaita itself will fall apart (due to lack of goal of removal of avidyaa, sadhaka who is in avidyaa). If avidyaa cannot be really known then removal of avidyaa also will not happen - as a result, the system of advaita itself will fall apart (become illogical and invalid).

It has to be accepted that advaitin just uses the word of anirvachaniya as an excuse to defining avidyaa. Whenever anything about avidyaa becomes illogical, it is an easy excuse to say that avidyaa is anirvachaniya and hence yuktivihina or devoid of logic (and that logic itself works under avidyaa).

Purvapakshin - advaita vedanta is destroyed

Since it is proven that avidyaa cannot be explained in anyway with respect to its reality-status, therefore the system of advaita vedanta itself is destroyed. Saying that avidyaa is anirvachaniya itself is contradictory to giving avidyaa the name of avidyaa. Above all such an entity which is anirvachaniya cannot be proved and hence doesn't exist at all. Its existence is as illusory as itself - this means that avidyaa doesn't exist. And the system of the vedas (advaita vedanta) is destroyed or defeated.

The advaitin cannot argue that Advaita Vedanta bases itself on non-dual entity of Brahman because then there is neither bandha nor moksha (because only Brahman exists). This would mean that there is no system at all. This is in fact killing oneself (the system of advaita vedanta through trying to explain itself kills itself - it becomes purposeless).

Thus it is proven that avidyaa is illogical with respect to its reality status which is termed as anirvachaniya.

Siddhantin - avidyaa is different from sat and asat

We accept that avidyaa is not sat because it doesn't exist at all times. After realization, avidyaa doesn't exist at all and hence it is not sat in reality status. Avidyaa cannot be said as asat because it exists temporarily, for an ignorant person. Therefore avidyaa is not asat (as asat is that which never exists).

It cannot be argued that avidyaa which is different from sat and asat cannot exist as it is a matter of experience for an ajnaani. This direct experience of the ajnaani is something which cannot be negated (unless by knowledge about the higher state of non-duality). Though we may not be able to prove avidyaa through logic, it doesn't mean that avidyaa doesn't exist. It just means that avidyaa cannot be an object of logic.

It shouldn't be said that then avidyaa is like Brahman as both are not objects of logic as Brahman ever exists whereas avidyaa ultimately never exists. That avidyaa doesn't exist becomes very clear when we try to find about it - the more we analyze about, the more the knowledge is strengthened that avidyaa doesn't exist at all. On the contrary, the more we analyze about Brahman the more we realize that Brahman alone exists and as our very nature of Consciousness. Though both are not subject to logic, Brahman is real whereas avidyaa is unreal.

Siddhantin - two levels of reality

Most of the objections of opponents stem from the fact that they aren't able to understand the two levels of reality - the vyaavahaarika or empirical and the paaramaarthika or ultimate. These two levels of reality aren't just coined by the advaitin but it is found in the shaastras. The shaastras on one hand say that the world exists and it is created from Brahman; and on the other hand the shaastras say that Brahman alone exists, beyond all dualities. Thus we have to understand the former which includes duality is just an empirical viewpoint whereas the latter which is based on non-duality is the ultimate level.

Empirically avidyaa is experienced directly but it is known that avidyaa is removed/negated through knowledge. Thus it is said that avidyaa is different from sat and asat - this is termed as anirvachaniya because avidyaa cannot be known through the means we have in this world (as all of them help avidyaa like servants of a house will help the master of the house). From the ultimate perspective, avidyaa doesn't exist at all as Brahman alone exists at all times - though duality might appear as existing, it is just an illusion and ultimately Brahman alone exists.

If it is asked as to what helps get rid of avidyaa then the answer is the shaastras and knowledge from shaastras. Even as an illusory lion in the dream helps a person come out of dream, similarly the illusory shaastras help a sadhaka to come out of the dream of avidyaa (to realize that one Brahman alone really exists).

Siddhantin - avidyaa's anirvachaniyatva only for shishyas

All various viewpoints or definitions like that of avidyaa being anirvachaniya is only for instruction to shishyas. A shishya is one who appears to be in avidyaa and therefore he requires knowledge about avidyaa and the way to get rid of avidyaa. The more and more he tries to analyze about avidyaa, he will be lead nowhere. Hence it is said that avidyaa is indescribable - instead he has to focus on the reality of Brahman which is explained in the shaastras. Through learning of the shaastras, avidyaa is removed or understood to be not-existent. And through implementation of shaastras or the knowledge that Brahman alone exists, the sadhaka realizes that avidyaa doesn't exist and Brahman alone exists (at all times as our own very nature of Consciousness).

Gaudapada acharya beautifully says "upadeshaat ayam vaado jnaate dvaitam na vidyate" - "all views of creation etc. are only for instruction and after knowing, there is no duality existing".

Siddhantin - many analogies of illusions are proofs

That avidyaa is neither sat nor sat from empirical viewpoint and ultimately doesn't exist at all is beautifully shown through various analogies of illusions in the world. These illusions are experienced by each one of us and therefore there is no proof required in order to establish these illusions (as illusions).

The most common example of an illusion is snake seen in rope. Here we find that ultimately snake doesn't exist at all. But empirically we know the snake will vanish after knowing the rope but it still appears as existing. Thus snake is neither sat nor sat. And any definition/explanation of snake is illogical (as it doesn't exist at all).

Water seen in desert is another example commonly used. Water ultimately doesn't exist in desert but empirically it appears as existing thus it is neither sat nor sat. Thus water is termed as anirvachaniya - it is indescribable. The moment we try to describe or define water, we will find that it is illogical as no water exists. But still we have to accept water as it is a matter of experience for one who sees the illusion.

Similarly, avidyaa ultimately doesn't exist as Brahman alone always exists. But empirically avidyaa is perceived by an ignorant person and hence it is anirvachaniya. Any effort to explain avidyaa is like trying to figure out about darkness (as it doesn't exist, therefore if we

take light to it, it will vanish but still it is a matter of experience). Of course for a person who is ever rejoicing in bliss, there is no avidyaa at all and therefore the system itself isn't valid. If such a realized master is seen as explaining concepts to a shishya we should remember that it is from the shishyas perspective as the master always remembers that Brahman alone exists. And even if the master sees and performs activities in the world, internally he knows that Brahman alone exists - therefore such a master is unaffected by activities even as an actor is unaffected by activities in a play.

Lastly we have the example of dream which explains everything with respect to the waking world. The dream world ultimately doesn't exist at all in the dreamer but when it is experienced, it appears as real and in the dreamer. Therefore the dream world is indescribable, yet ultimately it is unreal. That the dream is illogical itself shows that it is just an illusion. The reason that dream is experienced itself is enough proof to show that negation of such an illusion is essential (just because it is illogical doesn't mean it can be ignored completely).

Equating with dream, the waking world also doesn't ultimately really exist but it appears as existing for an ignorant person. For that person this illogical waking world or avidyaa has to be negated through knowledge of the shastras. Thus shastras aren't futile as they remove experienced avidyaa. And removal of this avidyaa is knowledge of Brahman - this removal isn't an illusion or illogical as it is just knowledge of its substratum (and since avidyaa isn't real therefore its removal is possible).

Sadhakas would do good to remember that any amount of analysis on avidyaa will lead us nowhere as it is just a matter of experience for the ignorant person (even as water is experienced by a person). Such a sadhaka who experiences avidyaa (and its effect of sorrow) should learn the shastras and through implementation of shastra jnaana strive to negate avidyaa. Negation of avidyaa is through knowing that avidyaa doesn't exist and what exists at all times is one Brahman alone (and that Brahman I am).

Conclusion

Avidyaa is neither sat nor asat and hence indescribable. But this doesn't mean that it doesn't exist as it is a matter of experience for an ignorant person. A person who experiences avidyaa should therefore strive to get rid of avidyaa through shastra jnaana (or Vedanta). Thus Vedanta isn't invalid. For a jnaani, Vedanta is as futile as the world as

Vedanta is direct experience for such a jnaani (who ever rejoices in bliss in constant contemplation of Brahman alone existing). But for an ajnaani Vedanta is required in order to get rid of avidyaa and ever rejoicing in bliss.

Avidyaa being indescribable is just as a way of teaching for a shishya as ultimately avidyaa doesn't exist at all. Merely arguing for the sake of arguing, with respect to logic shouldn't be undertaken as avidyaa will not stand logic but it is logical enough when we know that it is a matter of direct experience for an ignorant person. Instead of arguing a sadhaka should strive to get rid of avidyaa through knowledge of shastras. Thereby such a sadhaka will be able to realize the ultimate reality of non-dual Brahman and ever rejoice in bliss here and now itself.

May we all strive to remember that avidyaa is indescribable but a matter of experience; and hence we should strive to remove it through learning of shastras and implementation through constant contemplation of the truth that Brahman alone exists here as one's very nature of Consciousness so that we will be able to ever rejoice in bliss here and now itself

Anumaana used by purvapakshin and siddhantin

Purvapakshin

अविद्यायाः अनिर्वचनीयत्वानुपपत्तिः सत्यं, सदसद्विलक्षणस्य असत्यत्वात् शशविषाणवत् ।

Avidyaa's illogicality with respect to it being anirvachaniya (indescribable) is true, as that which is different from Sat and Asat is unreal, like hares of a horn.

Siddhantapakshin

अविद्यायाः अनिर्वचनीयत्वोपपत्तिः सत्यमेव, ज्ञानबाधितस्य सद्विलक्षणत्वात् प्रतीयमानस्य

असद्विलक्षणत्वात् अनुभवाच्च, स्वप्नवत् ।

Avidyaa's logicality with respect to it being anirvachaniya (indescribable) is true alone, as that which is negated by knowledge is different from Sat, that which is experienced is different from Asat and due to being experienced, like dream.

Sukha Nirupanam

ॐ सुखनिरूपणं

om sukhanirūpaṇam

स्वात्मचित्सुखं प्राप्नुयात्यदा ।

(तत्सुखंयदा प्रप्नुयात्तदा) ।

नन्दपूरुषः दुःखवर्जितः ॥१॥

svātmacitsukhaṁ prāpnuyātyadā |
(tatsukhaṁyadā prapnuyāttadā) |
nandapūruṣaḥ duḥkhavarjitaḥ ||1||

1. When a person attains one's own Consciousness blissful Self, then the person will be a happy person due to being devoid of sorrow (that happiness, ultimate, when one attains then the person will be a happy person due to being devoid of sorrow).

विश्वप्राप्तसुखं तु कारणं ।

दुःखवर्धनं नित्यवर्जितः ॥२॥

viśvapṛāptasukhaṁ tu kāraṇam |
duḥkhavardhanaṁ nityavarjitaḥ ||2||

2. But the happiness that is achieved from the world is cause of increase of sorrow by being devoid of changelessness (by being changeless in nature).

नामरूपविश्वस्यसेवनं ।

दुःखकारणं तत्सदात्विह ॥३॥

nāmarūpaviśvasyasevanam |
duḥkhakāraṇam tatsadātvih ||3||

3. Worship or seeking of the name-form world is always the cause of sorrow here.

ज्ञातविश्वस्वरूपपुरुषः ।

ब्रह्मनामकस्सेवनं कुरु ॥४॥

jñātaviśvasvarūpapūruṣaḥ |
brahmanāmakassevanam kuru ||4||

4. That person who knows the nature of the world (as temporary and sorrowful), should serve the entity named Brahman.

ब्रह्मभावनं स्वात्मरूपकं ।

तत् हि ज्ञानदं दुःखहीनकं ॥५॥

brahmabhāvanam svātmarūpakam |
tat hi jñānadam duḥkhaḥīnakam ||5||

5. Notion of Brahman as one's very Self; that definitely is bestower of knowledge and destroyer of sorrow.

ब्रह्मणस्वरूपं हि नन्दनं ।

द्वैतवर्जितोऽद्वैतरूपतः ॥६॥

brahmaṇassvarūpaḥ hi nandanam |
dvaitavarjito'dvaitarūpataḥ ||6||

6. Nature of Brahman definitely is rejoicing; by being devoid of duality and being of the nature of non-duality (duality causes sorrow and fear whereas non-duality leads to bliss which is beyond both happiness and sorrow).

सत्स्वरूपतः चित्स्वरूपतः ।

ब्रह्मतत्तुस्वात्मैवनिश्चयात् ॥७॥

satsvarūpataḥ citśvarūpataḥ |
brahmatattusvātmaivaniścayāt ||7||

7. That Brahman being of the nature of Existence and Consciousness is definitely, beyond doubt, one's own nature (own Self).

ब्रह्मभावना निष्ठपुरुषः ।

सर्वदासुखी स्वात्मनिष्ठतः ॥८॥

brahmabhāvanā niṣṭhapūruṣaḥ |
savadāsukhī svātmaniṣṭhataḥ ||8||

8. That person who is established in notion of Brahman (I am Brahman) is ever happy by being established in one's own Self (of the nature of bliss and non-duality).

स्वात्ममग्ननरो हि ब्राह्मणः ।

नन्दनन्दनो नन्दनन्दनः ॥९॥

svātmamagnanaro hi brāhmaṇaḥ |
nandanandano nandanandanaḥ ||9||

9. That man who is ever immersed in his own Self is definitely Braahmana; he is ever blissful and ever blissful.

Anukramaanika Nirdesham

1. Editorial – a general message
2. Brahmaananda Siddhi - an analysis of happiness and establishing Brahman as the ultimate source of happiness (bliss).
3. Chathussutra Prakaashah - a multi-part series on illumination of the first four sutras of Brahma Sutra through learning of the work of Shaareeraka nyaaya sangraha of Prakashatman.
4. Avidyaa Prakaashah - a multi-part series with written slokas explaining the illogicality of avidyaa as per Sri Bhashya and the answering of the same.
5. Sukha Nirupanam - explanation of happiness through a set of simple slokas (last time we saw explanation of sristi or creation). This section is dedicated to original work written but not explained in depth in order to help sadhakas in reflection of the concepts themselves.

1. Comments
2. Suggestions
3. Corrections (word, sloka, content etc.)
4. Would like to see specific content
5. Would like to contribute (through research from websites, don't need to write up the content yourself)

Mail admin@vedantatattva.org.

Feel free to forward this to anyone who might be interested.

Online download of the magazine can be found at <http://vedantatattva.org/vedantagroup/VedantaMadhuryam>

Subscribing and unsubscribing can be done by mailing admin@vedantatattva.org.